## EXHIBIT G

Walter M. Aller George S. Hubbolf Peart T. Roth Michael D. Westing Kellh D. McConneck Curl A. Christeson

THU POTES

HUBBELL, ROTH & CLARK, INC.

SENIOR ASSOCIATES Frederick C. Nevarre Gey J. Trecost Laverence R. Ansysta Kanneth A. Materiar Davids M. Monsere: Aundel L. Ford David P. Wilder

March 26, 2004

CHEF FINANCIAL DEFICIER

Deiphi M/C 480-410-166 5825 Delphi Drive Troy, MI 48098

Attention: Mr. Mark Hester, Asst. General Counsel

Re: Summary of Site Visit

Kettering, Ohio WWTP Tank Evaluation

HRC Job No. 20040218.02

Dear Mr. Hester:

Thank you for the opportunity to assist Delphi with evaluating the wastewater treatment tanks at your Kettering, Ohio facility. Mr. Ed Cote, P.E. of HRC visited the site on March 6, 2004 and the following is a report of the visit as well as follow-up tasks.

## Background

Mr. Cote visited the site and met with the following Delphi employees:

- Marty Cristo
- Mark Gooding
- Jerald Les
- Roy Knapp

Wastewater containing hexavalent chromium (chrome) is treated in two parallel, 75,000 gallon coated, carbon steel batch treatment tanks. The process consists of filling one tank while the other is in the treatment mode. The first step is to adjust the pH to between 2.0 and 2.5 with sulfuric acid while adding sodium bisulfite to reduce the hexavalent chrome to its trivalent state.

The tanks were constructed in 1977 from carbon steel with an epoxy coating. The foundation consists of a concrete ringwall with the welded steel floor installed over oiled sand. The area around the tank consists of gravel and is reportedly built on backfill. The wastewater tank farm is surrounded by a concrete retaining wall which extends approximately 4 feet above grade.

Tank Inspection and Repairs

DC 480

Crown Environmental's second shift personnel noticed a very small leak emanating from the bottom of one of the two batch chrome treatment tanks, Tank 2, and immediately took action. A 50,000 gallon sludge

Corporate Office: 555 Hulet Drive • P.O. Box 824 • Biocrnfield Hills, MI 48303-0824 (Mailing – P.O. Box) – 48302-0380 (UPS Zip)

Telephone: (248) 454-6300 • FAX: (248) 338-2592 or (248) 454-6312 • www.hrc-engr.com

Y:\200402\200402\\$\Proppost\Com\\$\makeydoe

Mr. Mark Hester . March 26, 2004 Job No. 20030218.02 Page 2

holding tank was put into service with heavy duty hose connections (camlock fittings) to provide storage for incoming wastewater while the suspect batch tank was taken out of service.

Delphi drained Tank 2 and cleaned the inside with a high pressure water spray. It was immediately evident that the coating had failed in a number of small areas where the coating was blistered or missing. It was also evident that the wastewater formed a tenacious coating on top of the epoxy coating because the sludge layer was very difficult to remove with high pressure water blasting.

Delphi retained American Testing Services, Ltd. (ATS), a local testing service, to perform a tank inspection per the American Society of Welding D1.1 code. They reported that 100% of the welds on the floor were inspected and they found that the thickness was approximately equal to the original design of 0.25 inch thickness. ATS also reported a 15 inch long crack in the weld on the tank bottom, which was the source of the leak. ATS' report also showed that the metal thickness on the blistered paint areas was approximately equal to the original design.

Delphi personnel also found a small area of corrosion on the bottom of the sidewall. This area and the 15 inch crack were repaired with welded patches (steel plates). The welding was performed by a local industrial welding service.

The tank coating was found to be in poor condition on the bottom and along the sides up to almost three feet. The entire tank bottom plus 3 feet up the side of the tank from the bottom was recoated. The individual blisters were also recoated. Coating was accomplished by sandblasting to white metal and coating with an epoxy novolac material. Delphi reported that this coating is used in the chrome plating areas with very good success. This coating is considered superior to the original coatings which were believed to be epoxy.

The tank was put back into service and it was found that the repair of the small leak was successful. The tank was then drained prior to HRC's visit to allow a visual inspection. Mr. Cote inspected the coating from the opened manway and the overhead walkway. The repaired surfaces appeared to be professionally applied similar to a new tank.

The Delphi team and Mr. Cote met after the inspection and reasoned that Tank 2 was not in danger of structural failure. The thickness testing showed that the tank was of similar thickness to a new tank, so there was no reason to suspect additional concerns. Based upon a review of the tank thickness testing and Mr. Cote's visual inspection, the team saw no immediate threat of a catastrophic tank collapse. The Delphi team and Mr. Cote decided to put the tank back into service as soon as practical since we deemed the risk of utilizing hoses with camlock fittings greater than the likelihood of a catastrophic tank failure.

The team discussed the need to drain and inspect all of the facility's wastewater tanks as soon as possible or instead wait for the July shutdown when the incoming wastewater flow is very small. We discussed the fact that these tanks are of similar construction and age as hundreds of others in the U.S. Automotive industry. HRC shared some information about another large manufacturing client's program to repair tanks and HRC was asked to learn more (see HRC's Findings and Recommendations section below). In particular, the Delphi team was interested in the qualifications of those that repaired the tanks.

## Secondary Containment

													1
The	team a	greed	hat wastewate	r treatm	ent tanks	arc	exem	pt from	n the	: federal	SPCC regul	ations. Mr.	Cote
noted	d that	many	corporations	have a	mixture	of	sites	with	and	without	secondary	containmen	t of

DC 481

Mr. Mark Hester March 26, 2004 Job No. 20030218.02 Page 3

wastewater treatment tanks. The tank farm is surrounded by a poured concrete retaining wall which has several relatively small cracks or expansion joints which would allow an escape of spilled liquid. The team agreed that most of the contents of a spill would be contained by the walls surrounding the porous stone over the large area, however, so the urgency of repairing cracks is minimal.

There is one area of the retaining wall which was damaged by a truck and the team recommended that it be repaired.

A storm sewer runs through the containment area with two manholes with solid covers. The team agreed that covers should be inspected and the gaskets replaced, if necessary, to prevent a possible migration offsite in the event of a spill. The team noted that a large spill could leave the site if it found its way through the soil into joints in the storm sewer.

## HRC's Findings and Recommendations

HRC contacted several tank companies and our other contacts in the automotive industry with the following to report:

- Delphi responded to the suspected leak on the sidewall immediately and appropriately. The tank
  was emptied and inspected both visually and with thickness testing. Two isolated areas were
  repaired with steel plates. The coatings were repaired with an epoxy novolac coating which is
  superior to the original coating. The new patched areas and the original coatings effectively protect
  the steel tank,
- 2. The Delphi team stated that they would prefer to repair Tank I during the July 2004 shutdown when flows are very low. Delphi further stated that they would perform thickness testing of Tank I immediately to substantiate their belief that there is no immediate threat of tank failure. HRC received a faxed report from Delphi on March 17 which showed that the thickness was approximately 0.25 Inches at four points taken on the sidewall. This testing indicates that the tank wall thickness is approximately equal to the original. HRC recommends that Tank I be taken out of service during the July shutdown, cleaned, inspected, and repaired as was done with Tank 2. This statement is based upon the fact that Tank 2 operated since 1977 under similar conditions and did not pose an imminent risk of catastrophic failure as demonstrated by a thorough tank inspection.
- 3. In general, the automotive industry's tanks were constructed per the American Petroleum Institute (API) Specification No. 650. API's standard for inspection and repair is covered under API 653. In general, the automotive industry uses certified API tank inspectors to inspect the tanks after they are drained and cleaned with water blasting.
- 4. The automotive industry generally uses experienced tank repair crews who are familiar with API's repair requirements. There are instances when a certified inspector has been used to oversee the repair work of local welders. Delphi's tank repairs were performed by a local industrial welding service, but it should be noted that the bottom is fully supported by a sand cushion and is subject to less stress than the sidewalls. Therefore, these welded patches are not as significant as on the sidewall.
- 5. The condition of tanks within the automotive industry varies depending upon the service, but in general, the situation is similar to Delphi's chrome tanks: the coatings have failed on the bottom, along the sidewall up to the baffles, and the baffles themselves. This is probably due to the fact that heavy abrasive materials tend to reside in the bottom of a batch tank.

DC 482

Mr. Mark Hester March 26, 2004 Job No. 20030218.02 Page 4

6. Automotive tanks appear to last longer than those in the municipal water and wastewater industry, for example. HRC suspects that a protective coating of sludge is formed over the original tank lining which protects the carbon steel. This coating is probably composed of precipitated metals combined with oils.

We appreciate the opportunity to provide Delphi with engineering services. Please contact us with any questions you may have.

Very truly yours,

HUBBELL, ROTH & CLARK, INC.

Curt A. Christeson, P.E. Principal/Vice President

Edward L. Cote, P.E. DEB Department Head, Industrial Facilities

CAC/jjb/scb

DC 483

TOTAL P.05